

Remarks

Applicant thanks Examiner Ronald Baum for the courtesy of a telephone interview held with Applicant's representatives, Lori Gordon and Salvador Bezos on August 9, 2006, regarding the present application.

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1 - 24 are pending in the application, with 1, 2, and 16 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, and 16 - 20 are presently amended. New claims 23 and 24 are sought to be added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,708,218 to Ellington, Jr. et al. ("Ellington"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that Ellington does not anticipate claims 1 - 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses.

Ellington is directed to "[utilizing] a hardware function performed in the data link control layer ... to determine if a received frame is an IP frame requiring IPSec processing, and if it is, to place the IPSec frame on a separate receive queue for subsequent inbound processing." (Ellington, col. 3, ll. 33-39). In order to accomplish this, Ellington further discloses that "to determine if an IP frame is an IPSec frame, the

type field in the Medium Access Control (MAC) header and the protocol field in the IP header are examined at the data link control layer. Once IPsec and non-IPsec traffic are separated into different receive or transmit queues, the processor handles the non-IPsec traffic, while the IPsec traffic is processed in parallel by a hardware IPsec assist component which performs the IPsec functions of encryption, decryption, Security Association (SA) management and key exchange." (Ellington, col. 3, ll. 44-54).

Ellington accordingly does not teach or suggest "processing [a] first layer of [a] packet in accordance with [a] first protocol and a first security policy; and processing [a] second layer of the packet in accordance with [a] second protocol and a second security policy at least partially in parallel with processing of the first layer of the packet when processing of the first layer of the packet uncovers sufficient information to support security processing of the second layer of the packet," as recited in amended independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, Ellington does not anticipate independent claim 1. The Examiner's rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Ellington does not teach or suggest, "processing [a] first layer of [a] data packet according to [a] first security policy ... wherein processing the first layer of the data packet according to the first security policy occurs at least partially concurrently with the step of processing [a] second layer of the data packet according to [a] second security policy," as recited in amended independent claim 2. For at least these reasons, Ellington does not anticipate independent claim 2. The Examiner's rejection of independent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Ellington also does not teach or suggest security processing modules capable of "process[ing] [a] first layer of [a] data packet according to [a] first security policy," in parallel with another security processing module, "processing [a] second layer of the data packet according to the second security policy," as recited in amended independent claim 16. For at least these reasons, Ellington does not anticipate independent claim 16. The Examiner's rejection of independent claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 3 - 15, 21, and 22 are not anticipated by Ellington for at least the same reasons as independent claim 2 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 - 15, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 17 - 20 are not anticipated by Ellington for at least the same reasons as independent claim 16 from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 16 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) is traversed and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,633

Date: August 14, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

525930_1.DOC